

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA – WESTERN DIVISION**

PEOPLE OF CITY OF LOS ANGELES  
WHO ARE UN-HOUSED, AS A  
CLASS REPRESENTED BY D.  
JACOBS, as representative of a class of  
unhoused persons who reside and resided  
in the streets and on the sidewalks of the  
City of Los Angeles,

Plaintiffs.

v.

KAREN BASS, ERIC MICHAEL  
GARCETTI, PAUL KREKORIAN,  
ROBERT BLUMENFIELD, NITHYA  
RAMAN, KATY YAROSLAVSKY,  
IMELDA PADILLA, MONICA  
RODRIGUEZ, MARQUEECE-  
HARRIS-DAWSON, JOHN LEE,  
CURREN PRICE, HEATHER HUTT,  
TRACI PARK, HUGO SOTO-  
MARTINEZ, KEVIN DE LEON, TIM  
Mc OSKER, MONIQUE CONTRERAS,  
1 "DOE" BROWN, ONE HUNDRED  
UNKNOWN NAMED DEFENDANTS,  
1-100,

Defendants.

CASE NO. 2:24-cv-09320 DOC (MAAx)  
*Hon. Judge David O. Carter, Ronald Reagan Cthse,  
Ctrm 10A; Hon. Mag. Maria A. Audero, Roybal Bldg,  
Ctrm. 880*

**JUDGMENT ON DEFENDANT  
MONIQUE CONTRERAS' MOTION  
FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT AND  
COURT'S DISMISSAL OF  
DEFENDANT "1 'DOE' BROWN"**

Defendant MONIQUE CONTRERAS' ("Defendant Contreras") Motion for  
Summary Judgment was heard on July 14, 2025 before the Honorable David


O. Carter in Courtroom 10A of the Ronald Reagan Federal Building and United States Courthouse for the Central District of California. Deputy City Attorney Ty Ford represented Defendant Contreras. Stephen Yagman who represents Plaintiffs PEOPLE OF CITY OF LOS ANGELES WHO ARE UN-HOUSED, AS A CLASS REPRESENTED BY D. JACOBS, as representative of a class of unhoused persons who reside and resided in the streets and on the sidewalks of the City of Los Angeles (“Plaintiffs”) did not make an appearance.

After considering the moving papers, Plaintiff’s failure to file any opposition papers, all admissible evidence, the Court’s file in this matter, and other matters presented to the Court, the Court GRANTED Defendant Contreras’ Motion for Summary Judgment as to the remaining excessive force and malicious prosecution claims against Defendant Contreras. Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 4(m), the Court also dismissed Defendant “1 DOE BROWN” for Plaintiff’s failure to serve Defendant Brown within 90 days of the filing of the Complaint and failure to prosecute the claims against Defendant Brown.

**IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED** that judgment be entered in favor of Defendant Contreras and Defendant Brown and against Plaintiffs on all remaining claims asserted in this action; that Plaintiffs recover nothing by reason of each and all their claims as set forth in the operative complaint against Defendant Contreras and Defendant Brown; and that the entire action be dismissed with prejudice.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

DATED: July 29, 2025

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
HONORABLE DAVID O. CARTER  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE